

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 14 and 22 are canceled.

Claims 26-29 are new.

Support for all new and amended claims is found throughout the specification and at the originally filed claims. Additionally, support for amended Claims 1 and 8 is found at page 5, lines 30-38. Support for amended Claims 13 and 21 is found at page 9, lines 23 -31. Support for new Claims 26-29 is found at page 3, line 26.

Upon entry of the amendment, Claims 1-13, 15-21, and 23-29 will be active.

No new matter is believed to have been added.

A new limitation, not described or suggested by the cited art, has been added to Claims 1 and 8. The claims of the present invention are novel, and the suspension of the present invention has, among other advantages, two significant advantages over the cited art: 1) that it the suspension can be made into, and used as a paste, and 2) that the suspension can be applied by knife coating. Favorable reconsideration of the claims is requested in view of the arguments and amendments presented in this paper.

The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of Claims 13-25 is obviated by the amendment of Claims 13 and 21. The 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejection of Claims 13-25 is obviated by amendment of Claims 13 and 21.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1-14, 16-22, and 24-25, as being anticipated by Julian. The rejection of Claims 14 and 22 is obviated by cancellation of these claims. Julian does not describe or suggest the limitation, found in Claims 1 and 8, that the surface of the low structured hydrophobic oxidic particles comprises an irregular fine structure in the range of 1 nm to 1000 nm, wherein the irregular fine structure comprises elevations, and wherein the elevations have an aspect ratio of greater than 1.0. Because

Julian fails to describe or suggest this limitation, Applicants respectfully submit that Julian does not anticipate the claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 13-14, 16-19, 21-22, and 24-25, as being anticipated by Keller. The rejection of Claims 14 and 22 is obviated by cancellation of these claims. Keller does not describe or suggest the limitation, found in Claims 1 and 8, that the surface of the low structured hydrophobic oxidic particles comprises an irregular fine structure in the range of 1 nm to 1000 nm, wherein the irregular fine structure comprises elevations, and wherein the elevations have an aspect ratio of greater than 1.0. Because Keller fails to describe or suggest this limitation, Applicants respectfully submit that Keller does not anticipate the claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claims 15 and 23 as being obvious over Keller in view of Tully. As previously described, Keller does not describe or suggest the limitations, found in Claims 1 and 8, the surface of the low structured hydrophobic oxidic particles comprises an irregular fine structure in the range of 1 nm to 1000 nm, wherein the irregular fine structure comprises elevations, and wherein the elevations have an aspect ratio of greater than 1.0. Tully, in describing "doctor blading" does not remedy the deficiency of Keller. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit the application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
Norman F. Oblon



Charles J. Andres, Ph.D.  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 57,537

Customer Number  
**22850**